



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

MJ

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,534	09/15/2003	Mutsumi Katayama	031115	8027
38834	7590	04/09/2007	EXAMINER	
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP			FAULK, DEVONA E	
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 700			2615	
WASHINGTON, DC 20036				
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS	04/09/2007		PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/661,534	KATAYAMA ET AL.
	Examiner Devona E. Faulk	Art Unit 2615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2007.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-3,5 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 4 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 15 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/05/03, 3/24/05</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

1. Claims 6-11 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 2/13/2007.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5 recites "The electronic volume device as claimed in any one of claims 1 to 4 wherein the electronic volume device conducts radio communications with the remote controller according to a communication procedure complying with a Blue tooth standard." The examiner asserts that the radio communication system conducts radio communication complying with a Bluetooth standard, not the electronic volume device (page 9, lines 10-22; Figures 1 and 2). The examiner has interpreted the claim as the radio communications system conducts radio communication with the remote controller.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tonella (US 5,883,963) in view of Hermann (US 6,360,187).

Regarding claim 1, Tonella discloses an electronic volume device remotely controlled by a remote controller (Figure 1), the electronic volume device comprising:  
means for receiving an i-th common volume level Dcom[i] (i=1 to N) on a common scale of N steps (volume inputted with input 150, Figure 1; column 3, lines 5-9);

means for converting received Dcom[i] into a j-th unique volume level Dvol[j] on a unique scale of M steps (M<N) (volume device,130; Figure 1;column 3, lines 27-30);  
and

means for controlling an attenuation factor based on the Dvol[j], wherein the converting means includes (microprocessor 140, Figure 1;column 3, lines 40-64);

means for storing an offset value Doff set between the Dcom[i] and the Dvol[j] (memory 145; column 4, lines 38-43) ; and

means for adjusting at least one of the Dvol[j] and the Doffset such that the received Dcom[i] agrees with a sum of the Dvol[j] and the Doffset (microprocessor; 140; Figure 1; column 4,lines 56-65).

Tonella fails to disclose wherein the adjusting means adjusts the Dvol[j] on a higher priority than the Doffset (microprocessor; 140; Figure 1).

Hermann discloses adjusting a volume according to a higher priority ( column 3, lines 38-47).

It would have been obvious to modify Tonella so that the volume is adjusted according to a higher priority as taught by Hermann so that the sound level can be adjusted according to a user's preference.

Regarding claim 3, Tonella as modified by Hermann discloses wherein when the common volume level Dcom[i] transmitted from the remote controller is a predetermined mute level, a present offset value Doffset is saved and the common volume level Dcom[j] is decreased to a predetermined level.(column 3,lines 4-11discloses that the input unit 150 enables a user to switch a loudness effect on or off and off would read on mute and decreasing the volume level; column 4, lines 40-66) .

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tonella (US 5,883,963) in view of Hermann (US 6,360,187) in further view of Turnbull et al. (US 6,980,092).

Regarding claim 2, Tonella as modified by Hermann discloses means for previously transmitting a sum of the unique volume level Dvol[j] and the offset value.

Art Unit: 2615

Tonella as modified fails to disclose transmitting to the remote control. Turnbull discloses transmitting to a remote control (column 5, lines 15-19). It would have been obvious to modify Tonella as modified by Hermann to transmit to the remote so that the remote will have the most recent processed data.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tonella (US 5,883,963) in view of Hermann (US 6,360,187) in further view of Mayuzumi (US 2002/0052182).

Regarding claim 5 Tonella as modified by Herman discloses a plurality of sources and that one of the sources could be a radio receiver (column 2, lines 41-45). Tonella as modified fails to disclose explicitly wireless transmission complying to a Bluetooth standard. Wireless transmission according to Bluetooth standard is well known in the art as taught by Mayuzumi. Mayuzumi discloses radio communications with the remote controller complying with a Bluetooth standard (pag3, paragraph 0046). It would have been obvious to modify Mayuzumi so that radio communications with remote controller comply with a Bluetooth standard so that a plurality of devices can be easily interconnected and so that the user can have all mobile and fixed devices coordinated.

#### *Claim Objections*

3. Claim 4 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Devona E. Faulk whose telephone number is 571-272-7515. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian Chin can be reached on 571-272-7848.

The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 2615. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DEF

  
VIVIAN CHIN  
SUPPLEMENTARY EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

4/20/7